26

vs.

1

2

MENDELSON & BROWN
MICHAEL S. BROWN, ESQ. State Bar No. 083358
P.O. Box 2426
1040 Marina Village Parkway, Suite B
Alameda, CA 94501
(510) 521-1211
Attorneys for Plaintiffs
BECK DOOFING OO THE CHADLES

**ORIGINAL** FILED

ttB 1 1 1993:

RICHARD W. WIEKING CLERK, U. S. DISTRICT COURT MORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BECK, and MARY BECK

#### UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

## NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BECK ROOFING CO., INC., CHARLES BECK, and MARY BECK,

Plaintiffs,

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY RELIEF

UNITED STATES FIDELITY & GUARANTY; INDUSTRIAL INDEMNITY; CONSOLIDATED AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY; and CONTINENTAL

INSURANCE,

Defendants.

Plaintiffs BECK ROOFING CO., INC., CHARLES BECK, and MARY BECK (collectively "Plaintiffs") allege as follows:

### NATURE OF ACTION

Plaintiffs bring this action for declaratory relief to 1. determine Defendants' respective obligations to indemnify Plaintiffs for governmental ordered investigation and remediation of hazardous waste as to Plaintiffs' property and the groundwater

1

2

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

thereunder pursuant to a policy of insurance respectively issued by Defendants.

## JURISDICTION AND VENUE

- The court has jurisdiction of this action under 28 2. U.S.C. Section 1332.
- The claims asserted in this Complaint arose in this 3. district and venue is proper in this district and court under 28 U.S.C. Section 1391(c) and Rule 105 of the United States District Court, Northern District of California.

### PARTIES

- Plaintiff BECK ROOFING CO., INC., is a corporation duly 4. organized and existing under the laws of the State of California and doing business in the State of California at all relevant times mentioned herein, and is an insured under the insurance policies referenced herein. Plaintiffs CHARLES BECK and MARY BECK are officers, directors, and shareholders of Plaintiff BECK ROOFING CO., INC., and are insureds under the insurance policies referenced herein.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that Defendant UNITED STATES FIDELITY & GUARANTY ("USF&G") issued respectively a comprehensive general liability insurance policy and an umbrella insurance policy for each year commencing in 1976 and terminating in 1982. Plaintiffs do not possess the USF&G insurance policies and declarations thereto and have made a

2

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

MP51371, and MP65204.

diligent search of those items. Based upon Plaintiffs' former insurance broker's records, the policy numbers are MP55200,

- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege 6. that Defendant INDUSTRIAL INDEMNITY ("Industrial") issued respectively a comprehensive general liability insurance policy and an umbrella insurance policy for each year commencing November 1, 1977, and terminating on November 1, 1981. Plaintiffs do not possess the Industrial insurance policies and declarations thereto and have made a diligent search for those Based upon Plaintiffs' former insurance broker's records, the policy numbers are LC783-7061 and LC8159202.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege 7. that Defendant CONSOLIDATED AMERICAN INSURANCE COMPANY ("Consolidated") issued a comprehensive general liability insurance policy for the period July 1, 1982, and terminating on July 1, 1983. Plaintiffs do not possess the Consolidated policy and declarations thereto and have made a diligent search for those items. Based upon Plaintiffs' former insurance broker's records, the policy number is CAP177263.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege 8. that Defendant CONTINENTAL INSURANCE COMPANY ("Continental") issued a comprehensive general liability insurance policy for the period July 1, 1986, and terminating on July 1, 1987. do not possess the Continental insurance policy and declarations thereto and have made a diligent search for those items.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

upon Plaintiffs' former insurance broker's records, the policy number is CBP00903674.

#### PRELIMINARY FACTS

- In January 1976, Plaintiffs had installed an 9. underground storage tank ("UST") which Plaintiffs operated until 1991. During the period of operation, Plaintiffs had no knowledge of petroleum leakage from the UST.
- On May 20, 1991, Plaintiffs had the UST removed at which time petroleum contamination was first discovered. time prior to that date did Plaintiffs discover or have reason to discover the existence of any contamination caused by leakage from the UST.
- On August 5, 1991, the Alameda County Health Care 11. Services Agency ("Agency") ordered Plaintiffs to investigate and to remediate the contamination. As a result, Plaintiffs engaged an environmental consultant who conducted an investigation and installed three monitoring wells.
- On February 3, 1992, the Agency notified Plaintiffs of 12. their obligation to reimburse the county for its costs relating to investigation and remediation of the contaminated soil and groundwater.
- As a result of the contamination and the governmental 13. order, Plaintiffs have incurred and will continue to incur costs in excess of \$50,000 relating to investigation and groundwater monitoring and clean up of the contaminated soil and groundwater.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

In April 1992, Plaintiffs notified USF&G, Industrial, 14. Consolidated, and Continental of the above claim and governmental order and requested indemnification for all costs associated with the investigation and remediation of the contamination of the soil and groundwater.

#### CLAIM FOR RELIEF

# (Declaratory Relief)

- Plaintiffs incorporate paragraph 1 through 14, 15. inclusive, as though fully set forth herein.
- Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that each above-referenced policy of insurance provides coverage for property damage caused by an accidental release of hazardous substances in the groundwater.
- Defendants have failed and refused to acknowledge or 17. deny coverage for the above-referenced claim.
- An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between Plaintiffs and Defendants concerning their respective rights and obligations under the respective policy of insurance in that Plaintiffs contend that the investigation and remediation costs relating to the hazardous substances caused by the UST leakage are covered under the respective policies of insurance issued by Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon Defendants. allege that Defendants deny that any of the damages related to the UST leakage are covered under the respective policies of insurance.

5



- 19. Plaintiffs desire a judicial determination of the rights and obligations of the parties herein and a declaration that the costs relating to investigation and remediation of the contamination caused by the UST leakage are covered under the respective policies of insurance and that Defendants are obligated to indemnify Plaintiffs for such costs associated with the investigation and clean up of the contamination as ordered by the Agency.
- 20. A judicial determination is necessary and appropriate at this time under the circumstances in order that the parties may ascertain their respective rights and obligations under each policy of insurance.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs pray for judgment as follows:

- 1. For a declaration that the costs relating to the investigation and remediation of the soil and groundwater ordered by the Agency are covered under the respective policies of insurance and that Defendants are obligated to indemnify Plaintiffs for such costs;
  - 2. For costs of suit incurred herein; and
- 3. For such other and further relief as the court deems just and proper.

Dated: February 10, 1993 MENDELSON & BROWN

MICHAEL S. BROWN
Attorneys for Plaintiffs

C-43